



INTRODUCTION

Paulo Granjo

Sofia Aboim

Alice Ramos

EDITORS

INCLUSION: A *SUI GENERIS* WORD AND A FALSELY CLEAR IDEA

The word “inclusion” has become increasingly conspicuous over the last few decades, both in well-intentioned, though vague, political speech, and as a guiding element for obtaining scientific funding in the social sciences.

It is a pleasant word to hear, especially if we do not give it too much thought: *inclusion* immediately sounds positive, desirable and moral. We tend to assume those favourable characteristics because we are also used to interpreting “inclusion” and “exclusion” as an opposite pair or concepts, which are clearly delimited and supposed to have positive or negative contents, according to the prefix. However, such opposition is not that simplistic.

On the one hand, the value we may attach to the word “inclusion” is neither abstract nor permanent, but rather depends on the place or situation for such *inclusion*. If we used *inclusion* to describe being well adjusted to incarceration in prison, life in the World War I trenches or being a member of the Ku Klux Klan, it is a fairly safe guess that almost no reader would see *inclusion* as positive, desirable or moral.

On the other hand, the opposition between *inclusion* and *exclusion* is not absolute or clearly evident at all but, in each particular case, an elaborate social construct. It is true that, as Levi-Strauss (1962) has shown us, the functioning of human thought is based on the manipulation of oppositions and similitudes. However, contrary to the use of several opposite notions that become clear once we define a criterion for their objective differentiation, every time we establish an opposition between a specific field of *inclusion* and *exclusion*, we are not taking notice of empirical evidence.

What we are doing is to arbitrarily select and emphasise a set of criteria or characteristics, amongst many alternatives, in order to highlight the similarity and/or possession between those who are “included”. Simultaneously, we emphasise another set of characteristics or criteria of differentiation and/or dispossession, which allow us to contrast such a group with that of the “excluded” (Granjo 2014). It is only in the light of this arbitrary negotiation, usually set-up according to the socially dominant valuation criteria, that the border between “in” and “out” (and between the “included” and the “excluded”) is proclaimed and seems evident.

This means that the selection and valuation of a specific *inclusion* field, as desirable or relevant, is not at all an evidence. We valued that field, instead of many other possible ones, as a result of an ethical and political choice – and the

reasons and processes underpinning that choice should also be the object of a demanding and self-reflexive analysis. This urge for epistemological criticism is reinforced by other characteristics of the relationship between *inclusion* and *exclusion*.

Firstly, it might be almost redundant to recall that every *inclusion* process implies and presupposes a previous *exclusion*. For a social scientist, however, it is also necessary to understand precisely “what” those people were *excluded* from; on which terms, and what meaning they ascribe to the *exclusion* we attribute them.

Secondly, every *inclusion* process into something is simultaneously an exclusion process from something else, at least in conjunctural terms. Since people and groups are not blank sheets of paper who live in some abstract social nonexistence, the *inclusion* in a group, a status, an identity, a system of practices, values or ways of feeling, implies their *exclusion* from previous opposite, or just different, groups or forms of *inclusion*. Again, this has individual and social costs, which should be taken into account.¹

Symmetrically, *exclusion* processes cannot project their results into a void. Therefore, an *exclusion* from something implies further *inclusions* – in new groups or systems of practices, representations and/or identities – to which the now “excluded” are pushed by the effects of the *exclusion* they suffered, or pulled in either by their new peers, or through their own attempts to be integrated and accepted.

Inclusion and *exclusion* are thus not really opposite sides of the same coin; they are processual and can, in fact, be the very same thing, looked at from different perspectives. This conundrum calls for a heightened awareness from social scientists and, ideally, requires the understanding of the diverse perspectives involved, beyond the dominant social, political and/or epistemological ones.

INCLUSION AND LIMINALITY

The dynamics of *inclusion* and *exclusion* are not, however, reducible to oppositional simplification and to one-dimensional criteria separating the *included* and the *excluded* along the lines of a single and clear frontier.

1 For instance, in several cultural contexts *inclusion* in market-oriented agriculture may induce *exclusion* from the local mechanisms of social solidarity, eventually leading to vulnerability and ostracism (Negrão 2001).

On the contrary, the grounded observation of empirical realities often shows us a “no-man’s-land”, that is, an area of ambiguity where some are no longer “others” but not yet “us”. This common process creates a grey zone for those who are no longer purely *excluded*, but are not yet plainly *included*. In other words, when we focus on the *inclusion* and *exclusion* processes, we are systematically confronted with situations and statuses of *liminality* (van Gennep 1909; Turner 1969).

In the classic definition, *liminality* corresponds to a transitory phase (delimited and projected to a time and space perceived as exterior to those of daily existence) in a path leading to integration in a new group of practices, values, knowledges, attitudes and/or status.² In order to differentiate it from other liminal processes, we will call it “integrative liminality” here.

However, instead of a transitory path for full *inclusion*, *liminality* can also become a perennial intermediate situation that reproduces and institutionalises an ambiguous status, from which, under exceptional conditions, only a few may escape. This is what we can call a “structural liminalisation”.³

Finally, it may often happen that liminality does not drive to *inclusion* at all but, instead, has *exclusion* as an outcome, after a variable and often long period of ambiguity.⁴ When such a period of “excluding liminality” lasts for long, it can easily be confused, in the perceptions of both social actors and external observers, with *structural liminality*. This happens because the difference between them is only apparent when considering the time and the specific characteristics of the systemic framework which sets up and reproduces that liminal situation – and both these factors are difficult to perceive, unless we already expect them to be possibly relevant.

Most importantly, *structural* and *excluding* liminalities correspond to *systemic* liminality situations. Furthermore, they can be relatively marginal and complementary or actually crucial for the existence and reproduction of the system, which would not function and endure without liminality, or without deep alterations that would change it into something else.⁵

2 This model of liminality corresponds, for instance, to an apprentice-like status (Lave and Wenger 1991), or to processes like the *rites of passage* originally studied by van Gennep (1909).

3 The historical cases of *goeses* (Xavier 2011), literate Cape-Verdeans (Batalha 2004) and *assimilados* (Moreira 1997) in the Portuguese colonial period are good examples of this kind of liminality.

4 This is, for instance, expectable and predominant with systemic labour precariousness.

5 See Piketty (2013) on the intrinsic role of precariousness in neoliberal capitalism, or the current structural precarity of the Portuguese scientific system.

Moreover, since they are both systemic and long-lasting, such kinds of liminality can induce *inclusion* into stable status groups, different from those that defined the *inclusion/exclusion* dynamic in relation to which the liminal situation was created. Therefore, we may observe diverse *inclusion/exclusion* processes, interacting mutually and affecting each other throughout such interaction.

CHAPTER OUTLINE

The theoretical reflexion on the ambiguity, complexity and plurality of meanings that we usually merge under the word “inclusion” was the benchmark to the call for the chapters in this volume. *Inside Out, Outside In* brings together 21 contributions authored or co-authored by researchers from the Institute of Social Sciences (ICS), each of which explores, either from a disciplinary or transdisciplinary approach, one or more aspects highlighted above. The volume is a collective effort covering a wide range of subjects, which represent the research being carried out at the ICS and contribute to the reflection on *inclusion* and *exclusion*.

The book is divided into seven parts, each of which includes three chapters that tackle various forms of liminality, the key conceptual lens with which we seek to overcome the *inclusion/exclusion* divide.

PART I is dedicated to alterity experiences in displacement situations, and to the manipulation of inclusion/exclusion dynamics.

In **Chapter 1**, Pedro Figueiredo Neto presents the Meheba Refugee Camp (Zambia) as a case depicting how ambiguous the boundaries between *exclusion* and *inclusion* can be. The camp’s purpose is to enclose, better manage and control displaced populations, whose rights are indefinitely suspended as long as they remain under humanitarian rule. However, refugee camps also provide protection, food provisions, access to basic health care and education, economic opportunities and training programmes that are commonly absent in the refugees’ place of origin, as well as in the hosting region where a given camp is deployed. They are illustrative of the paradox between the *inclusion* of the *excluded* (the refugees) and the *exclusion* of the supposedly *included* – the national citizens whose plight and needs have been neglected by their own state.

Exploring the potential of the “long-distance nationalism” concept, in **Chapter 2** José Manuel Sobral addresses the processes of community-building

and *inclusion* among the Santomean migrants and their descendants in Portugal. The author shows how those immigrants' transnational identification as Santomean is mainly a product of their own agency, by formal and informal ways that bind the members of the community and keep them connected to their "homeland". On the other hand, full understanding of this identification process also requires the analysis of the processes that tend to *exclude* such immigrants from the full exercise of citizenship in the settlement society, racism in particular.

In **Chapter 3**, Cristiana Bastos discusses the significant migration flux of Portuguese islanders to Hawai'ian plantations, during 19th and 20th centuries, and their ambiguous and liminal *inclusion* in the multi-layered local society, facing stereotypes and ethnicization (if not racialization) processes. The author finishes her article by raising a pertinent broader issue: the *exclusion* from national narratives of the Portuguese who reached the plantations and towns of British Guiana and Hawai'i escaping from oppression and destitution, when they were far more numerous than those following the path of imperial aspirations in the Portuguese African and Asian colonies.

PART II analyses precarious liminal citizenship processes resulting from social discrimination.

In **Chapter 4**, Francesco Vacchiano addresses the social insertion process of a group of refugees who arrived in Portugal in 2017, presenting the public policy initiatives undertaken and discussing problems still to be addressed. One main finding is that reception works frequently as a process of *marginal inclusion* into the most fragile strata of society, due to a process in which scarcity is paradoxically justified by the idea of having to do with people in extreme needs. The author concludes that it is urgent to reformulate the notion of reception. It should be changed from a benevolent concession into an opportunity for rethinking the structural mechanisms of social stratification operating in the receiving society, investing in a common future in which citizenship is not a corollary of nationality but a project of radical *inclusion*.

Chapter 5, authored by Alice Ramos, explores the opposition towards migration from a multi-layered angle that offers novel insights beyond the common opposition between migrants and nationals as two homogeneous groups. Starting from the perspective that immigrants are heterogeneous, the author deconstructs this simplistic dualism and discusses how immigrants from within and outside Europe see the entrance of other immigrants, as well as the extent to which their attitudes differ from those of nationals. By

exploring the role of values in the formation of a common cultural heritage, she concludes that the main divide opposes Europeans and non-Europeans, with the first being protective of “Europeanness” in contrast to the attitudes of non-European migrants.

Focusing on a social psychological approach to socially critical decisions, in **Chapter 6** Rui Costa-Lopes, Ana Filipa Madeira, Mariana Pires de Miranda and Wilson Moreira present empirical research testing how the contextual salience of a meritocratic norm impacts on these decisions towards low status group members. They also test the hypothesis that the social norm of descriptive meritocracy may legitimise the maintenance of inequality and limit actions towards *inclusion*. Findings indicate that when people are made to believe that society is structured along meritocratic principles, they will make inferences about whether people deserve to be in the situation they are in. Moreover, results show that people from low status groups are consistently treated in a more negative and exclusionary way.

In **PART III**, present day mobility and migration processes are addressed.

Marta Vilar Rosales examines in **Chapter 7** how and to what extent migrants interact with and make use of media content to feed imaginaries and expectations, design positioning strategies, manage belonging and handle exclusion and inclusion in the different spatial, cultural and political contexts that comprise their migration experiences. The chapter examines the print content published by the Portuguese media during 2011-15, focusing on three topics: Portugal as a hospitable and inclusive location for foreign middle classes; the attractiveness of diverse migration destinations for the Portuguese population; and the particular social, economic and political context, which promoted the simultaneous exploration of pulling and pushing aspects in Portugal and Brazil, by the Portuguese media.

Focused on the experience of immigrants from Goiás (Brazil) to Portugal, in **Chapter 8** Simone Frangella discusses the implications of informal and irregular networks in the construction of migrant routes and routines in transnational mobility. The author argues that the webs of vicinity projected to and re-appropriated from the regions of origin, as well as those uncertain and negotiated ones built up in the settlement locations, reconfiguring family and friendship interactions, are crucial to the feasibility of the migratory process and to highlight the complex ways migrants struggle to gain a sense of place. She argues that the strength of the concept of vicinity is in its use of *social inclusion* to address the structural inequality that permeates transnational mobility.

In **Chapter 9**, Nina Clara Tiesler analyses the dialectic of *inclusion* and *exclusion*, as empirically observed in several diasporic settings of Portuguese emigrants and Portuguese Muslims of Indo-Mozambican origin. She demonstrates how current analytical concepts and frameworks are too limited to grasp the complex and multi-dimensional formative processes which produce ethnicities. The outcome of her debate is the proposal of an innovative concept, “ethnoheterogenesis”, which is able to surpass such limitations and address the dialectic of homogenization and heterogenization inherent in ethnogenesis and ethnic change.

In a move from present to past, the three chapters in **PART IV** revisit the construction of categories, institutions and social relations, as well as imagination in the colonial contexts of Portuguese empire.

Isabel Corrêa da Silva reflects, in **Chapter 10**, on the multiple and often contradictory dynamics of *inclusion* and *exclusion* faced, in both 19th century Portugal and Brazil, by those belonging to an enduring but ambivalently regarded social category: the “Brasileiros”, those Portuguese emigrants who were successful in Brazil. Back in Portugal, the author argues, they were *excluded* from the elites in which they sought to be accepted, because although the modern world democratised elites with more widespread and inclusive integration criteria, the trend towards standardisation created new *exclusion* criteria by drastically reducing the acceptance of diversity.

In **Chapter 11**, Ângela Barreto Xavier revisits the first centuries of the Portuguese presence in Goa and the strategies followed by the Portuguese crown in order to conserve those territories and people under Portuguese rule. She analyses the physical and cultural miscegenation policies practised in 16th century Goa and contends that the *inclusive* and assimilationist policies led both to the reduction of difference and the multiplication of distinctions and hierarchies between the colonisers and the colonised, as well as within the latter. The author explores the tensions and dilemmas between *inclusion* and *exclusion* in the early-modern Portuguese empire, while establishing a critical dialogue between the contrasting interpretations of Gilberto Freyre and Orlando Ribeiro that brings the luso-tropicalist views of the 20th century to the fore.

Chapter 12 focuses on the *inclusion* and *exclusion* of Indian scholars within 19th and 20th century Portuguese historiography. Filipa Lowndes Vicente explores the life of Gerson da Cunha (1844-1900), a historian, doctor and collector born in Goa. Gerson da Cunha studied medicine in Bombay,

Edinburgh and London before returning to Bombay, and published numerous articles and books on themes related to the Portuguese in India. Despite his inspiring comparisons and connections between different histories and historiographies, Cunha was always on the fringe of both empires, which contributed to his invisibility as a historian and as a producer of knowledge about India.

The three chapters on gender and family dynamics in **PART V** bring to light different, though intertwined, processes of social change.

Vanessa Cunha, Leonor Rodrigues, Rita Correia, Susana Atalaia and Karin Wall, the authors of In **Chapter 13**, analyse the challenges posed to men by the emergence of caring masculinities as a dominant norm leading them to reshape their practices and identities. The ideal of caring masculinities has gained momentum as a key ally against hegemonic masculinity, gender inequality and the harmful traits of traditional masculinity itself. Nonetheless, the shift is not free of obstacles hindering men from full equity as partners and fathers, and their *inclusion* in the realm of care work. The examination of men and care in Portuguese society reflects the growing international concern about men's *inclusion* and harmful *exclusion* from care, relocating gender equality as a problem for men and not only for women.

With the new challenges brought about by the increasing visibility of the transgender category, Sofia Aboim, Pedro Vasconcelos and Sara Merlini, focus on the construction of masculinity by trans individuals in **Chapter 14**. They address both the internal plurality of trans masculinities and the ways in which apparent subaltern forms of 'doing masculinity' might, even if unwillingly, benefit from the privilege historically associated with manhood. Drawing on fieldwork with trans men in Portugal and the United Kingdom, the authors conclude that, after all, gender matters. The dividends of being perceived by others as men are acknowledged, even if they are unwanted or viewed with criticism, which is not the case of trans women, regardless of their greater visibility in public spaces and the media.

In **Chapter 15**, Marzia Grassi focuses on family mobility between Africa and Europe, while offering an overview of three empirical studies carried out in the national/transnational mobile spaces between Angola, Cape Verde, and Portugal. By examining the changes occurring in conjugality, parenthood and care, the author explores the processes of marginalisation that target some individuals over others by analysing the role of culture, the unequal access to resources and the impact of geographic distance. Transnational flows of

people are changing families and creating renewed forms of *exclusion* and *inclusion* that reshape political views, forms of gender power and policy making, let alone the performances and semiotics of transnational families as a multifaceted category.

In **PART VI**, the three chapters on learning and working processes address, in different but complementary manners, the ways in which resources are unevenly distributed.

Maria Manuel Vieira, Ana Nunes de Almeida and Ana Sofia Ribeiro, the authors of **Chapter 16**, explore the concept of reputation, emerging from the sociology of art, to untangle the criteria guiding educational options for parents and children. Drawing upon six case studies of state and private schools, the authors provide an account of objective and subjective motivations leading to a given school preference. They demonstrate that choice is constrained on the basis of a systemic *exclusion*, counteracting the ideal of equality in schooling, and revealing how reputation influences parent and children's preferences when searching for the symbolic gains awarded by the most reputable schools, even if they are state run. The state system also constructs its own reputation and selection mechanisms, thereby also reproducing inequality at the heart of a supposedly *inclusive* system.

In **Chapter 17**, Patrícia Ferraz de Matos explores the knowledge construction processes in two scientific societies. She examines the relationships between the Royal Anthropological Institute, created in 1871 and still internationally renowned today, and the Portuguese Society of Anthropology and Ethnology (SPAÉ), founded in 1918 and whose activity is nowadays considered peripheral. The author addresses the legitimacy of knowledge in different geographies across time, showing how the reputation of knowledge is key for understanding why claims from the centre are deemed more relevant. In the context of unequal globalisation processes, where the Anglophone world is still central, this chapter locates Portugal and Lusophone scientific production as a semi-peripheral space in present day scientific dynamics of power.

Paulo Granjo and João Feijó explore, in **Chapter 18**, the normative work ethics in three labour contexts (inside the largest industrial companies in Portugal and Mozambique, GALP and MOZAL, and amongst the workers of several smaller Mozambican companies with Portuguese, Chinese or Mozambican owners). Through these case studies, the authors compare how newcomers are integrated into their jobs and into the workers' group; the different visions of labour and duties/rights relationships; and, thirdly,

the impact of the previous aspects on the development and reproduction of labour cultures, workers' identities, safety and production. As the authors demonstrate, the capitalist model implies specific cultural settings, work cultures, and stereotypes about workers. By identifying multiple and different modes of *exclusion/inclusion*, they prove that even if there is a hegemony of capitalism, it is an adaptive one which implies fostering work cultures better understood from a transnational angle.

Finally, in **PART VII**, *inclusion* and *exclusion* are viewed from the angle of spaces and geographical boundaries.

In **Chapter 19**, Sónia Alves and Rosa Branco discuss the impact of urban requalification on resident families. They explore the role of globalisation and financialisation, via the recently created Urban Requalification Societies (SRU), in replacing programmes that aimed at maintaining and assisting poor families by transforming affordable privately rented housing into spaces for tourism and consumption. The authors also give a picture of the urban requalification models implemented in Portugal from 1974 to the present day. Focusing on the Porto Vivo SRU campaign in the Cardosas quarter, located in the heart of Porto city centre, they discuss how public policies professing to be *inclusive* may in fact create social *exclusion* and, instead of mitigating poverty dynamics, actually aggravate them by reinforcing social and spatial inequality.

Simone Tulumello and Alessandro Colombo explore, in **Chapter 20**, the spatial dimensions of urban *inclusion/exclusion* by addressing the topic of “condomínios fechados”, the Portuguese version of the gated community. The chapter presents the mapping – the first in Portugal, and among the very few available worldwide – of *condomínios fechados* in the cities of Lisbon and Cascais (besides Barreiro, where none were found). By reflecting comparatively on these cases, the authors suggest that the phenomenon of residential fortification needs to be considered in terms of the dimensions of production (real estate and planning) and consumption (social demand). Considering the characteristics of the Portuguese case, they argue that, with relatively low segregation (like most Southern European metropolitan areas), the concept of polarisation and fragmentation is useful to understand the patterns of urban *inclusion* and *exclusion*.

In the final chapter, **21**, Mónica Truninger, Sónia Goulart Cardoso, Fábio Rafael Augusto and Vasco Ramos explore the consequences of income inequality and its links with food poverty in food-insecure households. The analysis combines the material lack of resources with other forms of *exclusion*

that go beyond simple economic access. The authors start by defining food security from a perspective that emphasises the multi-layered nature of these concepts and reconstitutes the social, economic and political dynamics currently shaping accepted definitions. This serves as a backdrop to propose the importance of access in grasping the concept of food (in)security, leading them to engage both with food deserts and social exclusion. While food represents a strong element of social *inclusion* and identity, the focus on the physical and social aspects of access permits a conceptual refinement.

BEYOND THIS VOLUME

We believe this set of texts demonstrates that the criticism of simplistic and irreflexive uses of the idea of “inclusion” does not suppress its relevance as a trans-thematic and transdisciplinary research line. On the contrary, to conceive and approach *inclusion* and *exclusion* as ambiguous and socially situated notions, and to study their dynamics and processes according to their complexity and the key-role played by liminality, provides an innovative conceptualisation contributing to the advance of research and enhances the heuristic potential of those notions. We can even reasonably hope that such an approach by the social sciences might eventually influence the political and public speech about *inclusion* and *exclusion*, turning it into something less pedestrian and ideological.

However, this set of texts also highlights another crucial issue: the current *structural precariousness* of the Portuguese scientific system. Ironically, in a volume on “Inclusion”, only 19% of the first authors (and 15.8% of all authors) are *included* in the Research Career. All others are in a precarious and *liminal* situation, many of them have been for more than a decade, by holding temporary contracts or post-doctoral grants.⁶

Those numbers are not a random distortion. About $\frac{3}{4}$ of the ICS researchers are *precarious*, and this tendency is generalised throughout Portuguese research centres. Besides issues of social and labour fairness, this brings up serious problems for autonomous research institutions. It introduces instability into the medium and long-term planning and dissuades ground-breaking research

6 Besides the clearer cases, one of the 38 authors is a previously precarious researcher who had to immigrate in order to secure a permanent position.

programmes that may transcend ‘normal science’. It makes it harder to keep the researchers with more competitive specific competences, and is an obstacle to generational renewal and institutional culture reproduction.

Therefore, it seems that a new and urgent research challenge has been presented to ICS and its peers on the subject of “Inclusion”: the in-depth analysis of the *structural precariousness* of the Portuguese scientific system, its impact and how to overcome it, from the perspective of turning science into a lever for a healthier economy and society.

§ REFERENCES

- BATALHA, L. 2004. *The Cape Verdean Diaspora in Portugal: Colonial Subjects in a Postcolonial World*. Lanham: Lexington.
- GRANJO, P. 2014. “Raça e racismo são coisas que se aprendem”. In *O que é Racismo?*. Maputo: Escolar, 93-127.
- LAVE, J., E. Wenger. 1991. *Situated Learning. Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: CUP.
- LEVI-STRAUSS, C. 1962. *La pensée sauvage*. Paris: Plon.
- MOREIRA, J. 1997. *Os Assimilados, João Albasini e as Eleições*. Maputo: AHM.
- NEGRÃO, J. 2001. *Cem Anos de Economia da Família Rural Africana*. Maputo: Promédia.
- PIKETTY, T. 2013. *Le capital au XXI^e siècle*. Paris: Seuil.
- TURNER, V. 1969. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-structure*. Chicago: Aldine.
- VAN GENNER, A. 1909. *Les rites de passage*. Paris: Émile Nourr.
- XAVIER, Â. B. 2011. “*Conversos and novamente convertidos*. Law, religion and identity in the Portuguese kingdom and empire (16th and 17th centuries)”. *Journal of Early-Modern History*, 15: 255-287.

CITE THIS CHAPTER AS:

GRANJO, P., S. Aboim, A. Ramos. 2018. “Introduction”. In *Changing Societies: Legacies and Challenges*. Vol. I. *Ambiguous Inclusions: Inside Out, Inside In*, eds. S. Aboim, P. Granjo, A. Ramos. Lisbon: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais, 13-25.
<https://doi.org/10.31447/ics9789726715030.00>